

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed on 01/21/2005 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the following references fail to include a complete or partial English translation: DE 100 41 310 A1, DE 101 36 586 A1 and Malsay, S et al.

It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because Figure 6 has a written mistake, where the last step box says "ENDE", correct to right spelling "END"; moreover, Figures 2, 8, 9, 10, 15 and 18 are not clear enough to understand.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure

number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant mentions in paragraph [0042] the word "**influenciable**", which should be substituted by the word, "**influential**".

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The data table in page number 10 contains spelling errors. "Super meta **data data** file" in point 3 needs to be change to "Super meta **data** file". Moreover, "**time time** code (TC)" in point 5 needs to be change to "**time** code (TC)".

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 4115

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant states in paragraph [0156], "The multimedia information is made available to capture system 31 via...", where it should say, "The multimedia information is made available to capture system 31 via...".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knee et al. (Patent No 5,589,892). Hereinafter referenced as Knee.

Regarding **claim 1**, Knee discloses a streaming portal, comprising:

at least one display frame for playback of multimedia information from a program offered by an information provider whereby the multimedia information is made available as multimedia data and the multimedia data are played back as a group of data streams (The currently tuned channel [112] is displayed as exhibited on fig 11,

where an input signal [11] is connected to a receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60)

wherein the multimedia data are divided into a group of streaming units on the basis of the configuration data determined from the program (Display menu displays a plurality of menu items with their own icons, where the services are divided into TV guide [61] , pay-per-view and premium services [62], customer service and cable company information [63] and interactive services [64], column 17 lines 34-57 also exhibited on fig 6)

whereby a streaming unit is supplied with a label that identifies the type of multimedia data contained in the streaming unit and the streaming unit is supplied with a display frame that identifies the information provider and is played back as a data stream (As exhibited on fig 11, the programming information includes a TV guide logo [61] and information about the channel currently tuned [112], column 15 lines 25-40; moreover, logos 61A, 62A, 63A and 64A identify each of the services as exhibited on figure 6).

Regarding **claim 2**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein

the multimedia data is intended for playback on the streaming portal in a display frame that has been designed to play back all the data on the streaming portal and that identifies the information provider (The currently tuned channel [112] is displayed as

Art Unit: 4115

exhibited on fig 11, where an input signal [11] is connected to a receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60).

Regarding **claim 3**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein

the program is a television or broadcasting program (The received signal can be from a broadcast, cablecast, satellite, optical fiber or any other means of program distribution, column 1 lines 11-15).

Regarding **claim 4**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein

the program contains a group of predetermined criteria for the determination of the configuration data (Channels may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time, numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24).

Regarding **claim 5**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 4); in addition, Knee discloses the streaming portal of claim 4, wherein

the criteria comprise at least one of time, theme, performer, producer, director, local criteria, language, and topicality (Channels may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time, numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24).

Regarding **claim 8**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, further comprising a home page that has a menu including at least one of streaming channels, television, live stream, audio, interactive services, and latest news (Menu includes a TV guide icon [61A] which represents the current program schedule, column 17 lines 58-63 also exhibited on fig 6).

Regarding **claim 11**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein a number of display frames is grouped and assigned to a broadcast, whereby the grouping has a design that characterizes the broadcast (The received channels can be grouped in categories as exhibited on figure 38A).

Regarding **claim 13**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses a computer device comprising the streaming portal of claim 1 (Computer exhibited on figure 1).

Regarding **claim 14**, Knee discloses a process for providing a streaming portal with at least one display frame for playback of multimedia information of a program offered by an information provider, comprising:

making the multimedia information available for the streaming portal as multimedia data (Provide a user with schedule information for programs, column 1 lines 11-15 also exhibited on fig 5);

making the multimedia data available for playback as a group of data streams (Received programs may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time, numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24),

wherein determining a configuration of the multimedia information from the program and is made available as configuration data; dividing the multimedia data into a group of streaming units of the configuration data (Display menu displays a plurality of menu items with their own icons, where the services are divided into TV guide [61] , pay-per-view and premium services [62], customer service and cable company information [63] and interactive services [64], column 17 lines 34-57 also exhibited on fig 6);

marking a streaming unit with an identification of the type of multimedia data contained in the streaming unit (each listing contains a content specific identifier, column 19 lines 13-18);

and providing the streaming unit with a display frame for playback as a data stream that identifies the information provider (The currently tuned channel [112] is displayed as exhibited on fig 11, where an input signal [11] is connected to a receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60).

Regarding **claim 15**, Knee discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 14); in addition, claim 15 incorporates all the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, claim 15 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 2) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claim 2.

Regarding **claim 16**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 14); in addition, Knee discloses the process of claim 14, wherein the multimedia information is made available for the streaming portal as a receiver receives the multimedia information for the streaming portal (Receiver [12] receives the content as exhibited on figure 1).

Regarding **claim 18**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 14); in addition, Knee discloses the process of claim 14, wherein at least one of additional multimedia data and additional data is made available via at least one of a data storage unit and a network (Additional information about a program can be provided as exhibited on figure 21; where receiver [12] receives transmitted data stream from data provider, where the data stream contains information about a program, column 9 lines 59-63).

Regarding **claim 19**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 14); in addition, Knee discloses the process of claim 14, wherein



the program is made available together with the multimedia information (Receiver [12] receives transmitted data stream from data provider, where the data stream contains information about a program, column 9 lines 59-63).

Regarding **claim 23**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Knee discloses a computer program product that can be stored on a computer readable media and be fitted with a software code segment for initiating a computer device

for playback of multimedia information of a program offered by an information provider on the streaming portal of claim 1 when the product is implemented on the computer device (EEPROM [20] stores the application software, column 10 lines 57-60).

Regarding **claim 25**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 23); in addition, Knee discloses a computer readable media on which the computer program product of claim 23 is stored (Computer system, column 9 lines 49-58 also exhibited on fig 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Zigmond et al. (Patent No US 7,181,756). Hereinafter referenced as Zigmond.

Regarding **claim 6**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1), However, It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the display frame is fitted with at least one identifier. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Zigmond.

In a similar field of endeavor Zigmond discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein

the display frame is fitted with at least one identifier (A television program is displayed which is identified as a WebTV program, as exhibited of figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the

Internet, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of informing the viewer at all times about the type of programming being watched.

Regarding **claim 7**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 6). However, It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the at least one identifier comprises at least one of design of the display frame, icon for the type of stream, and icon for the type of multimedia data. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Zigmond.

In a similar field of endeavor Zigmond discloses the streaming portal of claim 6, wherein

the at least one identifier comprises at least one of design of the display frame, icon for the type of stream, and icon for the type of multimedia data (A television program is displayed which is identified as a WebTV program, where the identifier appears on the top-left side of the screen, as exhibited of figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of informing the viewer at all times about the type of programming being watched, where they can relate an image to each type of programming.

Regarding **claim 9**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1), However, It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose a link to the Internet. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Zigmond.

In a similar field of endeavor Zigmond discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, further comprising

a link to the Internet (Logical addresses are embedded within a broadcast television signal, where such logical addresses may provide links to the internet, column 5 lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of expanding the capabilities of the streaming portal which would provide the users the ability to go online and navigate the internet and even find more information regarding to the show currently watched.

Regarding **claim 10**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1), However, It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose a display frame assigned to each program broadcast also includes a link that provides access to the multimedia data that corresponds to the broadcast and which extends beyond the content of the broadcast. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Zigmond.

In a similar field of endeavor Zigmond discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein

a display frame assigned to each program broadcast also includes a link that provides access to the multimedia data that corresponds to the broadcast and which extends beyond the content of the broadcast (Logical addresses are embedded within a broadcast television signal, where such logical addresses may provide links to the internet and remote content related to a program being watched, column 5 lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing such element, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of expanding the capabilities of the streaming portal which would provide the users the ability to go online and navigate the internet and even find more information regarding to the show currently watched.

10. **Claims 12, 24 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Menez (Pub No US 2002/0083453). Hereinafter referenced as Menez.

Regarding **claim 12**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1). However, It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose at least one display frame which is multilingual. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Zigmond.

In a similar field of endeavor Zigmond discloses the streaming portal of claim 1, wherein

at least one display frame is multilingual (Selecting the language of on-screen displays and audio broadcasts, where the on screen display include close captioning and teletext, paragraph [0001]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of providing a better service to customers since different many languages are spoken around the world and this would be an excellent way to expand the marketability of a product.

Regarding **claim 24**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 12); moreover, Knee discloses a computer program product that can be stored on a computer readable media and is fitted with a software code segment for initiating a computer device for implementation of the process of claim 12 when the product is implemented on the computer device (EEPROM [20] stores the application software, column 10 lines 57-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of including software which is needed in order to modify the streaming portal.

Regarding **claim 26**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 24); moreover, Knee discloses a computer readable media on which the computer program product of claim 24 is stored (Computer system, column 9 lines 49-58 also exhibited on fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Zigmond, for the purpose of including a computer in which to include the software needed to modify the streaming portal.

11. **Claims 17, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Iwamura (Pub No US 2003/0059047). Hereinafter referenced as Iwamura.

Regarding **claim 17**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 16); in addition, Knee discloses that the received signal can be from a broadcast, cablecast, satellite, optical fiber or any other means of program distribution, column 1 lines 11-15, which reads on "the multimedia information is made available by way of at least one of an antenna and a cable receiver".

It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the multimedia information is converted to digitized information material in the form of multimedia data in a conversion

unit. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Iwamura.

In a similar field of endeavor Iwamura discloses the process of claim 16, wherein wherein

the multimedia information is converted to digitized information material in the form of multimedia data in a conversion unit (A set top box includes a tuner as well as other devices known in the art, such as an analog to digital converter, paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose of converting analog signals into digital signals, which would expand the marketability of the device since it would be able to receive analog signals as well as digital signals.

Regarding **claim 20**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 14); however, it is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the marking occurs in a stream unit header. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Iwamura.

In a similar field of endeavor Iwamura discloses the process of claim 14, wherein the marking occurs in a stream unit header (Each packet contains a packet header, where the packet header contains an identifier that can be used to identify the various packet types, paragraph [0070]).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose helping identify each packet and the content being transmitted.

Regarding **claim 27**, Knee discloses a computer network for providing a streaming portal with at least one display frame for playback of multimedia information from a program offered by an information provider, comprising:

a receiver via which the multimedia information is made available (receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60);

and at least one computer system, wherein a configuration of the multimedia information determined from the program is made available as configuration data (Provide a user with information about programs, column 1 lines 11-15 also exhibited on fig 5),

wherein the multimedia data can be divided into a group of streaming units on the basis of the configuration data (Display menu displays a plurality of menu items with their own icons, where the services are divided into TV guide [61] , pay-per-view and premium services [62], customer service and cable company information [63] and interactive services [64], column 17 lines 34-57 also exhibited on fig 6),

wherein at least one of the streaming units has a marking that identifies the type of multimedia data contained in the streaming unit (Received programs may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time,

numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24; where each listing contains a content specific identifier, column 19 lines 13-18),

and wherein at least one of the streaming units is provided with a display frame that identifies the information provider (The currently tuned channel [112] is displayed with information about the program as exhibited on fig 11, where an input signal [11] is connected to a receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60).

It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose a conversion unit via which the multimedia information becomes available as multimedia data whereby the multimedia data are played back as a group of data streams. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Iwamura.

In a similar field of endeavor Iwamura discloses a conversion unit via which the multimedia information becomes available as multimedia data whereby the multimedia data are played back as a group of data streams (A set top box includes a tuner as well as other devices known in the art, such as an analog to digital converter, paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose of converting analog signals into digital signals, which would expand the marketability of the device since it would be able to receive analog signals as well as digital signals.

Regarding **claim 28**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 27); in addition, claim 28 incorporates all the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, claim 28 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 2) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claim 2.

Regarding **claim 29**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 27); in addition, claim 29 incorporates all the limitations of claim 8. Therefore, claim 29 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 8) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claim 8.

Regarding **claim 30**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 27); in addition, Knee discloses the computer network of 27, wherein a data transmission occurs into data flows that have been separated into categories (Channels may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time, numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24).

Regarding **claim 31**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 27); in addition, Knee discloses the computer network of claim 27, wherein a data transmission occurs via at least one of the Internet, a LAN, and a WAN (Another possible information source is the internet, which is a source of vast amounts of information, column 46 lines 1-4).

Regarding **claim 32**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 27); in addition, Knee discloses the computer network of claim 27, further comprising a broadcasting unit for the execution of live broadcasts (Television receives distributed broadcast signals, column 3 lines 58-60 also exhibited on fig 1).

Regarding **claim 33**, Knee discloses a computer system that provides a streaming portal with at least one display frame for playback of multimedia information from a program offered by an information provider, the first computer system comprising:

a receiver via which the multimedia information is made available (receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60);

wherein the multimedia data are played back as a group of data streams  
(Received programs may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time, numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24),

wherein the computer system is a capture system (Menu in fig 6),

wherein a configuration of the multimedia information determined from the program is made available as configuration data (Channels may be group according to a criterion, such as program category, program content, rating, time, numerical order or any other logical grouping, column 30 lines 20-24),

wherein the multimedia data can be divided into a group of streaming units on the basis of the configuration data (Display menu displays a plurality of menu items with

Art Unit: 4115

their own icons, where the services are divided into TV guide [61] , pay-per-view and premium services [62], customer service and cable company information [63] and interactive services [64], column 17 lines 34-57 also exhibited on fig 6),

and wherein at least one streaming unit has a marking that identifies the type of multimedia data contained in the at least one streaming unit in such a way that the at least one streaming unit is provided with a display frame that identifies the information provider (Each listing contains a content specific identifier, column 19 lines 13-18; moreover, the currently tuned channel [112] is displayed with information about the program as exhibited on fig 11, where an input signal [11] is connected to a receiver [12] which receives a transmitted data stream from a data provider, column 9 lines 59-60).

It is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose a conversion unit via which the multimedia information become available as multimedia data,. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Iwamura.

In a similar field of endeavor Iwamura discloses a conversion unit via which the multimedia information become available as multimedia data, (A set top box includes a tuner as well as other devices known in the art, such as an analog to digital converter, paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose of converting analog signals into digital

Art Unit: 4115

signals, which would expand the marketability of the device since it would be able to receive analog signals as well as digital signals.

Regarding **claim 35**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything as claimed; in addition, claim 35 incorporates all the limitations of claim 33. Therefore, claim 35 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 33) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claim 33.

Regarding **claim 36**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything as claimed; in addition, claim 36 incorporates all the limitations of claims 27 and 28. Therefore, claim 36 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 27 and 28) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claims 27 and 28, respectively.

Regarding **claim 37**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 36); in addition, Knee the method of claim 36, wherein

the peripheral system is fitted with a first server unit for playback of the streaming portal that is designed as a link unit and is used for the execution of streaming requests (The data processor is configured to generate service requests and provide them to a central location for processing, column 6 lines 33-39).

Regarding **claim 38**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 36); in addition, Iwamura discloses the method of claim 36, wherein the peripheral system is connected to a second server unit that is a dynamic RealVideo server and is used to implement tasks (MSO [110] broadcasts the content to set top box [130], paragraph [0051] also exhibited on fig 1; where it is inherent that the broadcaster stores the content locally or externally).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing the peripheral system is connected to a second server unit that is a dynamic RealVideo server and is used to implement tasks, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose of providing a place where the content being distributed is stored.

Regarding **claim 39**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 38); in addition, Iwamura discloses the method of claim 38, wherein the tasks comprise at least one of administration, storage, and execution of multimedia data for the first server unit (MSO [110] broadcasts the content to set top box [130], paragraph [0051] also exhibited on fig 1; where it is inherent that the broadcaster stores the content locally or externally).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing the peripheral system is connected to a second server unit that is a dynamic RealVideo server and is

used to implement tasks, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose of providing a place where the content being distributed is stored.

Regarding **claim 41**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 36; in addition, Knee the method of claim 36, wherein the peripheral system comprises a management and control unit (Microcontroller [16] which manages every process taking place in the system as exhibited on fig 6).

Regarding **claim 42**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything as claimed; in addition, claim 42 incorporates all the limitations of claims 14, 27 and 28. Therefore, claim 42 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 14, 27 and 28) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claims 14, 27 and 28, respectively.

Regarding **claim 43**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything as claimed; in addition, claim 43 incorporates all the limitations of claims 14, 27 and 28. Therefore, claim 43 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 14, 27 and 28) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claims 14, 27 and 28, respectively.

Regarding **claim 44**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 43); in addition, Knee discloses the computer system of claim 43, wherein the user system is fitted with a multimedia personal computer with an on screen user prompt (Components of the electronic program schedule can be mounted as part of a



Art Unit: 4115

television receiver, VCR, personal computer or a multimedia player, column 9 lines 50-58 also exhibited on fig 1).

Regarding **claim 45**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 43); in addition, Knee discloses the computer system of claim 43, wherein the user system is a home recorder (Components of the electronic program schedule can be mounted as part of a television receiver, VCR, personal computer or a multimedia player, column 9 lines 50-58 also exhibited on fig 1).

Regarding **claim 46**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything as claimed; in addition, claim 46 incorporates all the limitations of claims 14, 27 and 28. Therefore, claim 46 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 14, 27 and 28) since it is inherent to the process claimed in claims 14, 27 and 28, respectively.

12. **Claims 21, 22 and 40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Hoffberg (Patent No 6,850,252). Hereinafter referenced as Hoffberg.

Regarding **claim 21**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 14); however, it is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the program is made available separately from the multimedia information. However, the examiner

maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Hoffberg.

In a similar field of endeavor Hoffberg discloses the process of claim 14, wherein the program is made available separately from the multimedia information (The program options, such as the electronic program guide or information about the content, can be transmitted on a separate channel through a separate communication network, column 143 lines 35-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Hoffberg, for the purpose of having a dedicated bandwidth for the content itself, since this way the information about the content would be using another transmission channel with its own reserved bandwidth.

Regarding **claim 22**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 21); however, it is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the program is made available via a network. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Hoffberg.

In a similar field of endeavor Hoffberg discloses the process of claim 21, the program is made available via a network (The program options, such as the electronic program guide or information about the content, can be transmitted on a separate channel through a separate communication network, column 143 lines 35-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Hoffberg, for the purpose of having a dedicated bandwidth for the content itself, since this way the information about the content would be using another transmission channel with its own reserved bandwidth.

Regarding **claim 40**, Knee discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 36); however, it is noted that Knee fails to explicitly disclose that the peripheral system comprises a maintenance system fitted with input tool software. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Hoffberg.

In a similar field of endeavor Hoffberg discloses the method of claim 36, wherein the peripheral system comprises a maintenance system fitted with input tool software (Computer systems that provide electronic content and services, involves maintenance and service in order to maintain them, column 42 lines 51-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing a link to the Internet, as taught by Hoffberg, for the purpose sustaining a server running as efficient and reliable as possible.

13. **Claim 34** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Iwamura, further in view of Navab et al. (Pub No US 2002/0094189). Hereinafter referenced as Navab.

Regarding **claim 34**, Knee and Iwamura disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 33); in addition, Knee discloses a capture software (Menu in fig 6) and an administrator unit (Microcontroller [16] which manages every process taking place in the system as exhibited on fig 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee by specifically providing element, as taught by Iwamura, for the purpose of including an administrator unit that can keep track of everything that is going on in the system.

The combination of Knee and Iwamura still fail to disclose a RealVideo footage raid and a SMIL software creator. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such elements, as taught by Navab.

In a similar field of endeavor Navab discloses a RealVideo footage raid; a SMIL software creator (The system convert the resulting AVI filer into a RealMedia file and creates a SMIL file using the meta file, paragraph [0071]);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify primary reference and secondary reference by specifically providing a RealVideo footage raid and a SMIL software creator, as taught by Navab, for the purpose of implementing a media player and a markup language that

allows to do multimedia presentations, where SMIL technology has the ability to created presentations with the ability to display multiple file types.

The combination of Knee, Iwamura and Navab still fail to disclose a raid. However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide a footage raid.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Knee, Iwamura and Navab by specifically providing a footage raid, for the purpose of dividing and replicating data among multiple storages, which increase data reliability and performance.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNIOR O. MENDOZA whose telephone number is (571)270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8am - 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza  
Examiner  
Art Unit 4115

/J. O. M./  
December 14, 2007  
/Jefferey F Harold/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4115